

Appl. No. : 10/034,847
Filed : December 21, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending in the application. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for allowance of Claims 7-12 and 14-30. Applicant amends Claims 1-2 to overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,894 to Hirai, et al. (hereinafter Hirai). Applicant amends Claims 1-2 and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant respectfully contends that Hirai fails to teach or suggest each of the elements in Applicant's Claims 1-2, as amended.

Hirai discloses an IC module having an antenna coil 20A formed on a substrate 2, and an IC chip 3 placed on the substrate 2. *See generally*, Hirai Figures 1-8 and Col. 6 ll. 8-10. The substrate, IC chip, and coil antenna are encapsulated in a resin molding or resin package 4. *Id.* at ll. 11-12. Hirai states that the "resin package 4 is formed by transfer molding using a thermoset resin, or injection molding using a thermoplastic resin." *Id.* at Col. 7 ll. 4-6. Hirai describes the resin molding process with reference to Figures 5 and 6.

As shown in Figures 5 and 6, a single cavity 50 is filled with resin, thereby encapsulating the substrate, IC chip, and coil antenna. *See e.g., Id.* at ll. 38-39 ("...a melted resin is introduced into cavity 50 through a gate 52. Thus a resin package 4 is formed."). In Figures 5 and 6, reference numbers 5A and 5B refer to the different molds used in the resin packaging process. The molds 5A and 5B define the single cavity 50 that is filled with a resin. The molds 5A and 5B are used during the manufacturing process and are not part of the finished resin package 4. Thus, Hirai discloses only a single resin part and does not describe or suggest more than one resin part of an antenna.

Appl. No. : 10/034,847
Filed : December 21, 2001

Claim 1, as amended, recites a small antenna comprising “a dielectric chip formed...by a plurality of different molded resin parts.” Because Hirai discloses only a single cavity 50 which is filled with resin, Hirai fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of different molded resin parts. Indeed, Hirai fails to even suggest how different molded resin parts may be advantageous in a small antenna.

Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable because Hirai fails to set forth, either expressly or inherently, every element of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1.

Claim 2 similarly recites a small antenna having a first resin part and a second resin part, different from the first resin part. Each of the resin parts cover portions of an antenna conductor. For the same reasons provided above in relation to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully contends that Hirai fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 2. Hirai fails to teach or suggest the use of two different resin parts, each covering a different part of an antenna conductor. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 2.

Discussion of Dependent Claims 3-6

Claims 3-6 depend from one of Claims 1-2 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 3-6.

Discussion of Objection to Claim 13

The Examiner objected to Claim 13 as depending from a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 is dependent from Claim 1 and is believed to be allowable in light of the allowability of Claim 1, as explained above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes

Appl. No. : 10/034,847
Filed : December 21, 2001


pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the claim limitations discussed above represent only illustrative distinctions. Hence, there may be other patentable features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

If there are any impediments to allowance of the claims that can be resolved with a telephone call, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned. Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 1/15/04

By: 
Thomas R. Arno
Registration No. 40,490
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

AMEND
S:\DOCS\RBH\RBH-2520.DOC
011404